



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Man," and the possible Aramaic equivalent of *φρονίμως* in the master's comment on the behavior of the unrighteous steward in the parable (Luke 16:8)—a word meaning "kindly" instead of "wise" or "prudent"—are some of the points to which Professor Nestle has called attention.

The whole work is a very important contribution to biblical research. The two learned ladies and the German professor who have produced it have laid scholars under a great obligation. Is it asking too much to suggest an English translation of the Syriac texts?<sup>2</sup>

W. TAYLOR SMITH.

EXETER, ENGLAND.

EINLEITUNG IN DAS NEUE TESTAMENT. VON THEODOR ZAHN.  
I. Band. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf.  
(Georg Böhme), 1897. Pp. viii + 489. M. 9.50.

THIS work must take its place at once as one of the standard textbooks on New Testament introduction, and can hardly fail to be regarded as the most important one from the conservative point of view. Professor Zahn's eminent scholarship is unquestioned, and the value of his investigations in the history of the New Testament canon is so fully recognized, even by those who differ radically from his conclusions, that his treatment of the problems of New Testament introduction will certainly attract, and as certainly reward, eager and close attention. Since the second volume will contain the treatment of matters just now most in dispute—the gospels, the Acts, the chronology—and comments on the recent works of Professors Harnack and Ramsay, it seems advisable to reserve criticism until the appearance of that volume. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves in this notice chiefly to a brief statement of some of the positions maintained in the present volume, which deals—after a preliminary chapter on the original language of the gospel, and the relative use of Aramaic and Greek by Jews in New Testament times—with the epistles of James and Paul.

The *Epistle of James* was addressed to Christianity as a whole at a time when the whole was Jewish Christianity. Neither heathen ancestry nor heathen surroundings (idolatry, unchastity, etc.) are suggested. The sins condemned are the inherited faults of Jews (1:21), such as Jesus found in the Pharisees. Silence as to the binding validity of the Mosaic law, and the unembarrassed union of the law of liberty with

<sup>2</sup>At the request of the publishers, Messrs. C. J. Clay & Sons, the editors call attention to a page of *corrigenda*, to the *Palestinian Syriac Lectionary*, sent to them a few days ago.

justification by works, point to a time before the controversy between Paul and the Judaizers, hence before 50 A. D. The book was written by James, the brother of Jesus. "His manner of thought and speech shows a resemblance to the discourses of his brother, Jesus, which seems the more to rest on a natural relationship because James stood so little under the educating influence of Jesus during his public activity, and because the resemblance seems so little like artful imitation or conscious dependence." This somewhat startling suggestion, which is in reality not far from Spitta's view that the book was written by a Jew, is modified by the supposition that James became acquainted with the words of Jesus; and it was on the basis of his teaching and the impression of his personality, as well as through native likeness to him, that James attained a Christian character which in the circle of the oldest Christianity put him almost above the apostles. Yet "he did not feel, like his brother, the impulse to work as a missionary," and his letter "contains scarcely anything of the gospel, and of all the writings of the New Testament it is least adapted to give us a picture of the preaching that founded faith, which nevertheless it presupposes." This curious picture of one who stood nearest to Jesus and farthest from the gospel seems fitted to disclose rather than to remove the difficulties that stand in the way of the traditional view of the book. Yet Zahn's argument against the pseudonymous character of the book is strong. A fabricator might well have chosen the name of James, but would hardly have omitted to add "the Lord's brother," and could not have failed to take on the character of James. But "neither in his quality as brother of Jesus, nor as first bishop of Jerusalem, nor as the Israelite who held with tenacious love to his people and to the temple, nor as the man of legal manner of life whom the Judaizers put upon their shield, nor as the super-legal ascetic, does the James of history and of legend meet us in this letter." Pseudepigraphs never escape anachronisms, but in James there is nothing modern; or at most "the absence of clear signs that the author and reader have drunk of the new wine of the gospel." Though genuinely Israelitish in character, the letter is not the work of a Jew (Spitta), for it would have been used, in that case, as a Jewish book, as were Sirach and Wisdom, and value would have been found in the very fact that a Jew bore witness to Christian truth.

Zahn is doubtless right in maintaining that the absence of all reference to events and beliefs especially connected with James is more consistent with the genuineness of the letter than with its pseudonym-

ity. One does not always speak in his known character, but if he is represented as speaking, his known character must be assumed. Yet Zahn can hardly be said to have met the current view that the epistle is spiritually related to Hermas, Clement, and Justin, rather than to primitive Christianity; and Zahn's own observations may well incline one to think that the book is by some later James, or, with Harnack, that the first verse is a mistaken superscription.

Accepting the south Galatian theory, Zahn thinks the *Epistle to the Galatians* addressed to the churches founded in Acts 13: 14—14: 23, and revisited (Gal. 4: 13) in Acts 16: 1—5. It was written from Corinth before Silas and Timothy joined Paul there (Acts 18: 1—4), in the spring of 53 A. D., and is therefore the oldest of Paul's epistles. This is also the view of Professor McGiffert, who, however, finds Paul's second visit to Galatia in Acts 14: 21, and thinks Galatians must have been written before Acts 16: 1—4.

*1 Thessalonians* was written from Corinth in the summer, and *2 Thessalonians* in the fall, of 53 A. D. Of especial value is the suggestion that *2 Thess.* 2: 3—12 is not a Jewish apocalypse (Spitta, etc.), but a product of that Christian prophecy which Paul held in high esteem. This apocalypse of Antichrist may have been a Christian prophetic utterance of Caligula's time.

*1 Corinthians* is, not only from chap. 7, but from chap. 5 on, chiefly a reply to the letter of the Corinthians to Paul in answer to a still earlier lost letter of his. The majority of the Corinthian church were inclined to push Christian liberty to the point of obscuring the line that separated them in life, in worship, and in thought from their heathen past and environment. Paul guards both against the abuse of freedom by the majority and against the denial of the principle of freedom by the minority. The worse danger lay in the direction of a spirit of too great independence, which threatened to cut the Corinthian church off from other churches and from its founder. This was the root of the factious tendency with which Paul deals in chaps. 1—4. Zahn's view of the much discussed parties or divisions of 1: 12 is that parties or sects in the full sense did not yet exist. Yet the germs of four divisions existed which could easily grow into sects. The work of Apollos in Corinth was probably the source of this state of things, and it is with those who said, "I am of Apollos," that 1: 17—4: 21 chiefly deals. The "Cephas" people were probably those who could say that they were converted (baptized?) by Peter. Against them 3: 16—20 is directed, but also 1: 1; 9: 1—3; 15: 8—10. It is with

these people, also, that Paul must deal in 2 Cor. 2:17 ff.; 5:12; 11:1—12:18, after his fears regarding them, revealed in 1 Cor. 9:1—18, had been confirmed. Entirely distinct from this Judaistic tendency is the character of those who say they are "of Christ." These are such as assert their independence of all human authority, and it was of such that the majority of the Corinthian church was composed. It was they who dictated the somewhat assuming letter which Paul answered in 1 Corinthians. Paul had less occasion to mention them in chaps. 1—4, because chaps. 5—15 dealt with their views and practices. They were puffed up, and needed to learn their dependence on Paul, on the churches, and on Christian tradition (4:6, 7, 18, 19; 14:36, 37), and the truth that love is the chief virtue (8:1; 13). They meet us again in 2 Cor. 10:1—11 (12—18?), for Zahn, with Baur, finds a reference to them in vs. 7, but he escapes Baur's view that they are Judaizers by giving chaps. 11—12:18 another reference (to the Cephas party), and, rightly, finding no reference to acquaintance with the earthly Jesus in 5:16.

Zahn argues at length and in part persuasively against the view that either a visit or a letter intervened between 1 and 2 Corinthians. Accordingly 2 Cor., chaps. 10—13, belongs where it stands, and Paul's severity against his adversaries from without is not inharmonious with the conciliatory tone of chaps. 1—9 toward the church itself. It should be noticed, by the way, that the fact that chaps. 10—13 deal with outsiders is a serious objection to Zahn's view that they deal with the "Christ" party and the "Cephas" party of 1 Corinthians.

The *Epistle to the Romans* was written to a church composed of Gentiles and Jews, the majority being *Jews* (7:1—6; 8:15, etc.). Paul does not write to them *by virtue of* his calling as apostle to Gentiles, but *in the interests of* that side of his apostolic calling. He wished to prepare the way for his missionary work among the heathen of Rome and of the West (15:15, 16), though also to promote a good understanding between Jewish and Gentile Christians in the Roman church.

*Philemon*, *Colossians*, and *Ephesians* were sent together by Paul from *Rome*, probably in the second year of his imprisonment (Acts 28:30). *Colossians* is dominated by the thought of the errors directly combated in chap. 2. The errorists are Jewish Christians who held some regulations of the law to be binding, and added certain ascetic demands which rested upon the idea that matter was the sphere of the rule of spirits, from whom one could escape only by abstinence, especially from flesh and wine. The *στοίχαι* are not stars or spirits, but the material elements of the world. The errorists are not worshipers

of angels, but try to imitate by self-mortification the abstinence and devotion of angels (2:18, τῶν ἀγγέλων, subj. gen.). This teaching has no connection with Essenism, apart from which ascetic tendencies, in connection with philosophical culture, were not uncommon in Judaism (cf. Rom., chap. 14; Heb.).

*Ephesians* is a circular letter to the churches of Asia not founded by Paul, hence not to Ephesus. It is referred to in Col. 4:16 as the letter that would come to Colossæ "from Laodicea."

The *Epistle to the Philippians* was not the first letter Paul had written to this first church in Europe. He would not have failed to write his thanks for their many earlier gifts (4:15, 16). Now they have again sent him money by Epaphroditus in his imprisonment at Rome. We have not, however, his first response to that gift, but an answer to a still later letter from them, expressing anxious fears and forebodings, which Paul writes to remove. Paul repeats from his former letter (3:1) a warning against evil workers, not Jews (Lipsius, McGiffert), but Jewish Christians (Rom. 16:17), who have as yet no footing in Philippi. Entirely different from them are the Jewish Christian preachers in Rome (1:15-18), who, though not friendly to Paul, and using the opportunity of his trial to push their work at the expense of his, are yet preachers of the gospel, in the issue of whose work Paul can rejoice. The unworthy Christians of 3:18-19 are still another class.

After a discussion of the situation presupposed by each of the *Pastoral Epistles*, and an elaborate argument for the second imprisonment of Paul, Zahn argues at length for the genuineness of these epistles. The personal notices which they contain are not copied from other letters, and are not invented. New facts and persons, or known persons in new relationships, appear in casual and lifelike references. The unfavorable picture of Timothy is unconceivable in the work of a pseudo-Paul (cf. Phil. 2:20-22). "All legendary fiction of the ancient church was panegyric."

What could have been the purpose of the invention of these letters? Not to set forth an order of church life, for, apart from the fact that 2 Timothy has no such aim, the position of Timothy in Asia and of Titus in Crete is without analogy in the post-apostolic church. Further, the organization of the churches is nowhere described, but only assumed, and that which is assumed belongs to the earlier, not the later age. Elders and bishops are still identical, whereas Asia Minor had a monarchical episcopate at the end of the first century (Rev., Ignatius). It is not the official functions, but the personal

qualities of the bishop and the deacon with which the letters are concerned; and it is only the common Christian morality that is required of them, for Titus 1:6, 1 Tim. 3:2, 12 (so 1 Tim. 5:9) forbid not second marriages, but adultery. The laying on of hands is no more a sacrament of magical effect here than in Acts.

Neither were these letters fabricated as a weapon against false doctrines. The teachers of a different doctrine dealt with in 1 Tim. 1:3-7; 4:7; 6:3-10, 20; Titus 1:10-16; 3:9; 2 Tim. 4:8, are Christians chiefly of Jewish birth, who are concerned with myths and speculations, not gnostic but rabbinical in character; not yet anti-Christian, but useless and leading to endless disputes. Timothy and Titus are themselves in danger of being led astray by them. They regard certain Old Testament laws as binding, not circumcision and Sabbath (Galatians), but laws of purity, which they develop in an ascetic direction. Some have carried these tendencies so far as to put themselves outside of the church (1 Tim. 1:20 [*cf.* 2 Tim. 4:14]; 6:21). Still further and more pernicious developments of these tendencies are predicted for the future (2 Tim. 2:16, 17; 4:3, 4), with the requirement of an ascetic life, like that of angels (1 Tim. 4:1-3), and a general moral degeneracy (2 Tim. 3:1-5 [6-9]). These false teachers do not belong to the post-apostolic age, for they do not answer to the Judaists denounced by Ignatius, nor to those met with in Barnabas, nor to the Ebionites of the pseudo-Clementines. Nor do they belong to the earlier Pauline age. They do not demand circumcision (Galatians), nor appeal to an older apostle or the mother church (Corinthians), nor rest upon a natural philosophy (Colossians). A writer after Paul would have found neither in his present nor in Paul's letters the picture of the errors he describes.

To other objections Zahn replies that 1 Tim. 3:18 probably cites as Scripture only the passage from the law, and adds a proverbial saying which Jesus had also used. A formulated baptismal confession, of which traces are found in 1 Tim. 6:12-16; 2 Tim. 2:2-8; 4:1, need not have originated after Paul's death. The stress on sound doctrine has points of contact in Rom. 6:17; 16:17; 1 Cor. 4:17; 15:1-3; Col. 2:6f.; Eph. 4:20f.; and may have been occasioned by an increasing inclination toward corrupt teaching, and by the approaching death of Paul. Moreover, the "sound doctrine" was morally wholesome rather than ecclesiastically correct (1 Tim. 1:10; 6:1; Tit. 2:1-14). It is not un-Pauline to insist on the fulfillment of the law of God and of Christ. Indeed, "sentences that sound so un-Pauline as 1 Cor.

7 : 19, or which could be misinterpreted as a fusion of genuine Pauline doctrine with its opposite so easily as Gal. 5 : 6, are not to be found in these letters." On the other hand, Paul's doctrine of redemption and justification is fully expressed (Tit. 2 : 11-14 ; 3 : 4-7 ; 1 Tim. 1 : 12-16 ; 2 : 4-7 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 9). In regard to language, a pseudo-Paul would have imitated Paul's speech and would have betrayed the imitation by mistakes, of which these letters show no trace. The linguistic peculiarities of the three letters are due to nearness of date and similarity of conditions.

It is unfortunate that Zahn does not think the theory of composite origin worthy of serious discussion, since this solution of the many-sided problem is now in favor (Jülicher, Harnack, McGiffert, etc.). He says only : "Hypotheses of this sort, in which regularly only their discoverers believe, could lay claim to earnest consideration only by virtue of an unusual degree of acumen and pains in their elaboration" (p. 481).

It should be added that Zahn's detailed discussions of special points in the notes following each chapter are as solid and instructive as one would expect from so learned a scholar. Much recent work comes here in brief review, though one does not, I believe, learn from Zahn that there are such text-books of New Testament introduction as those of Weiss, Holtzmann, and Jülicher. For this independence of predecessors the preface prepares us, and it is the author's purpose to deal with the problems themselves, rather than to give a history of critical opinion.

FRANK C. PORTER.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

LE NOUVEAU TESTAMENT de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ expliqué au moyen d'introductions, d'analyses et de notes exégétiques. Par L. BONNET, docteur en théologie. *Évangiles de Matthieu, Marc et Luc*. Seconde édition, revue et augmentée par Alfred Schroeder, pasteur à Lausanne. Lausanne : Georges Bridel et C<sup>ie</sup>, Éditeurs, 1895-7. Pp. 663. Fr. 12.

ALTHOUGH this commentary on the synoptic gospels bears the date of 1895, it was not published entire until the middle of November, 1897. The earlier date is that of the first of the four parts in which it was issued. A commentary upon the gospels and Acts was prepared by Bonnet and Baup upon the basis of the well-known work of Otto von Gerlach, the friend of Hengstenberg, and published in 1846. The remaining books of the New Testament were covered by Bonnet alone,